

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-7202**

---

JERRY NATHAN PRUITT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GARY MAYNARD, Director, South Carolina  
Department of Corrections; CHARLES M. CONDON,  
Attorney General of the State of South  
Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Cameron McGowan Currie, District  
Judge. (CA-02-3028-6-22)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2004

Decided: February 13, 2004

---

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jerry Nathan Pruitt, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Chief  
Deputy Attorney General, Melody Jane Brown, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jerry N. Pruitt seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Pruitt has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED